

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 NATHANIEL DWAYNE CAETANO, ) Case No.: 1:22-cv-0261 JLT HBK (PS)  
12 Plaintiff, )  
13 v. ) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR  
14 KINGS COUNTY SHERIFF, et al., ) EMERGENCY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
15 Defendants. ) (Doc. 4)  
16 )

17 Nathaniel Caetano seeks emergency injunctive relief, asserting that he “labored for 4,444 days”  
18 without payment. (Doc. 4.) He seeks immediate payment of the alleged unpaid wages and profits  
19 from a bond he believes should be sold. (*Id.* at 1-4.)

20 Importantly, “[a] preliminary injunction is an ‘extraordinary and drastic remedy’... never  
21 awarded as of right.” *Munaf v. Geren*, 553 U.S. 674, 689-90 (2008) (internal citations omitted). “A  
22 plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that  
23 he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities  
24 tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest” *Am. Trucking Ass’n v. City of Los*  
25 *Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir.2009) (quoting *Winter v. NRDC, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)).  
26 Based upon the Court’s review of the pleadings, it is not clear Plaintiff may succeed on the merits, and  
27 or suffer an irreparable harm. Indeed, a monetary injury—even if severe—is an insufficient ground  
28 for injunctive relief. *Sampson v. Murray*, 415 U.S. 61, 90-92 (1974). That is because monetary loss

1 may be compensated and is a reparable harm. *See Am. Trucking Ass'ns*, 559 F.3d at 1052; *Sampson*,  
2 415 U.S. 90-92. Because Plaintiff clearly claims only a monetary injury, injunctive relief is not  
3 appropriate. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**: Plaintiff's request for emergency injunctive relief  
4 (Doc. 4) is **DENIED**.

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: **April 18, 2022**

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE